



PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Serge Jean Maurice Mister
Serial No.: 09/343,958
Filing Date: June 30, 1999
Confirmation No.: 8512

Examiner: Kambiz Zand
Art Group: 2132
Docket No.: 0500.9904131
Our File No.: 10500.99.4131

Title: **METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PREVENTING INTERCEPTION OF
INPUT DATA TO A SOFTWARE APPLICATION**

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Certificate of First Class Mailing
I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the
United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an
envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for
Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on
this date.

2/23/05
Date

Christine A. Wright
Christine A. Wright

AFTER FINAL RESPONSE

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed December 23, 2004, Applicant submits the following remarks.

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 10-15 and 24-29 are allowed and that claims 6, 8, 21, 23, 35 and 37 would be allowable if rewritten to include limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Remaining claims 1-5, 7, 9, 16-20, 22, 30-34 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fadem et al. in view of Young et al. In the "Response to Arguments" section of the final action, the Examiner states that Applicant's previous arguments were not persuasive because "the features upon which Applicant relies are not cited" in the rejected claims. However, the office action cites "insertion of fake data" as the feature upon which Applicant relies to overcome the references. It appears that the Examiner